Adams, Hope

From:

Sent:

To:

Cc:

Subject:

Follow Up Flag: Flag Status:

Mr. Stark,

Yes, this witness order is acceptable to SACE, CCL, and UF.

Thank you.

Kate Lee Mixson Staff Attorney Southern Environmental Law Center 525 East Bay St., Suite 200 Charleston, SC 29403 t: 843-619-4613 | f: 843.414.7039

www.SouthernEnvironment.org



From: Stark, David <david.stark@psc.sc.gov> Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2021 12:02:15 PM

To: Kate Lee Mixson; Heather Smith; J. Ashley Cooper; willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com; Nelson, Jeff; Grube-Lybarker, Carri; Hall, Roger; jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com; Ledford, Peter-energync; tspeer@turnerpadget.com; Pittman, Jenny; robsmith@mvalaw.com; Mustian, Ben; bdurant@sowelldurant.com; Rebecca J. Dulin; Bateman, Andrew

Cc: PSC_Contact

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: DEC/DEP Solar Choice Tariff Cases Procedural Matters (2020-264-E and 2020-265-E)

I want to be sure that I am clear on the proposed witness order – both for this party and others.

With the understanding the parties have agreed to present direct testimony separate from rebuttal testimony, I would like to clarify that SACE/CCL wants to present the Rebuttal of Finley in the Rebuttal Phase, Beach Direct Testimony in the Direct Phase, and Moore Surrebuttal in the Rebuttal Phase.

I have put together what I understand is the total proposed witness order (see attached).

Please confirm or correct this order if it is incorrect.

Regards,
David Stark

Prom: Kate Lee Mixson kmiths-leaf
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
To: Heather Smith kmiths-leaf
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Heather Smiths-leaf Scotter, scotter, which also means a scotter of the sent scott

Charleston, SC 29403 t: 843-619-4613 | f: 843.414.7039 www.SouthernEnvironment.org



From: Smith, Heather Shirley < Heather. Smith@duke-energy.com >

Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 3:07:25 PM

To: Stark, David; J. Ashley Cooper; willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com; Nelson, Jeff; Grube-Lybarker, Carri; Hall, Roger; iwkuykendall@jwklegal.com; Ledford, Peter-energync; Kate Lee Mixson; tspeer@turnerpadget.com; Pittman, Jenny; robsmith@mvalaw.com; Mustian, Ben; bdurant@sowelldurant.com; Dulin, Rebecca Jean; Bateman, Andrew

Cc: PSC_Contact

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: DEC/DEP Solar Choice Tariff Cases Procedural Matters (2020-264-E and 2020-265-E)

Dear Hearing Officer Stark:

Given the complex technical and legal issues surrounding this case, the Companies propose brief opening and closing statements by counsel, not to exceed 3 minutes each. The Companies believe this will allow for a more efficient process as it will allow the parties to summarize the legal and factual components of the case to be supported by the witnesses of Huber, Harris, Hager and Faruqui individually after the direct testimony of the other parties. The Companies believe it is important that these witnesses' responsive testimony be heard after the testimony to which they are responding.

Accordingly, the witness order proposed by the Companies for their witnesses is as follows:

Direct Phase:

George Brown (only prefiled direct)
Leigh Ford (consolidated direct and rebuttal)
Lon Huber (direct and supplemental)
Brad Harris (direct)

Rebuttal Phase:
Janice Hager
Brad Harris
Ahmad Faruqui
Lon Huber

Thank you,

Heather Shirley Smith
Deputy General Counsel
Duke Energy
40 W. Broad Street, Suite 690
Greenville, SC 29601
S64.370.5045 office
Pagheather.smith@duke-energy.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The preceding e-mail message (including any attachments) contains information that may be confidential, may

The preceding e-mail message (including any attachments) contains information that may be confidential, may be protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or may constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

From: Stark, David <david.stark@psc.sc.gov> Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 9:25 AM

To: Smith, Heather Shirley < Heather. Smith@duke-energy.com >; J. Ashley Cooper < ashleycooper@parkerpoe.com >; willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com; Nelson, Jeff < inelson@ors.sc.gov >; Grube-Lybarker, Carri < clybarker@scconsumer.gov >; Hall, Roger < RHall@scconsumer.gov >; jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com; Ledford, Peter-energync <peter@energync.org >; klee@selcsc.org; tspeer@turnerpadget.com; Pittman, Jenny <jpittman@ors.sc.gov>; robsmith@mvalaw.com; Mustian, Ben < BMustian@ors.sc.gov >; bdurant@sowelldurant.com; Dulin, Rebecca Jean < Rebecca.Dulin@duke-energy.com >; Bateman, Andrew abateman@ors.sc.gov>

Cc: PSC_Contact < Contact@psc.sc.gov >
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: DEC/DEP Solar Choice Tariff Cases Procedural Matters (2020-264-E and 2020-265-E)

*** CAUTION! EXTERNAL SENDER *** STOP. ASSESS. VERIFY!! Were you expecting this email? Are grammar and spelling correct? Does the content make sense? Can you verify the sender? If suspicious report it, then do

and spelling correct? Does the content make sense? Can you verify the sender? If suspicious report it, then do not click links, open attachments or enter your ID or password.

Thank you al for the information.

March 10th is appropriate for the witness order and virtual plan, as Mr. Middleton points out.

-David Stark

From: Bateman, Andrew <abateman@ors.sc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 8:59:53 AM

To: Stark, David <david.stark@psc.sc.gov>; Heather Smith heather.smith@duke-energy.com; J. Ashley Cooper ashleycooper@parkerpoe.com; willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com <willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com>; Nelson, Jeff <inelson@ors.sc.gov>; Grube-Lybarker, Carri clybarker@scconsumer.gov>; iwkuykendall@jwklegal.com; peter@energync.org <peter@energync.org>; Pittman, Jenny
ipittman@ors.sc.gov>; robsmith@mvalaw.com
ipittman@ors.sc.gov>; robsmith@duke-energy.com>; Heather Smith heather.smith@duke-energy.com; peter@energy.com>; Peter@energy.com>; Willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com
ipittman@ors.sc.gov>; ipiduykerdall@jwklegal.com
ipittman@ors.sc.gov>; ipiduykerdall@jwklegal.co willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com <willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com>; Grube-Lybarker, Carri <clybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Hall, Roger <RHall@scconsumer.gov>; jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com <jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com>; peter@energync.or@

<peter@energync.org>; klee@selcsc.org <klee@selcsc.org>; tspeer@turnerpadget.com <tspeer@turnerpadget.com>; Nelson, Jeff <jnelson@ors.sc.gov>; Pittman, Jenny <jpittman@ors.sc.gov>; jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com

<jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com>; Mustian, Ben <BMustian@ors.sc.gov>; bdurant@sowelldurant.com

<bdurant@sowelldurant.com>

Cc: PSC_Contact <Contact@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: RE: DEC/DEP Solar Choice Tariff Cases Procedural Matters (2020-264-E and 2020-265-E)

Mr. Stark,
Page

ORS does not expect this hearing to exceed the two days scheduled.
Page

Thank you,
Page

Andrew

From: Stark, David <david.stark@psc.sc.gov> Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 12:05 PM

To: Heather Smith < heather.smith@duke-energy.com >; J. Ashley Cooper < ashleycooper@parkerpoe.com >; willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com; Nelson, Jeff < inelson@ors.sc.gov >; Grube-Lybarker, Carri < clybarker@scconsumer.gov >; Hall, Roger < RHall@scconsumer.gov >; jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com; peter@energync.org; klee@selcsc.org; Bateman, Andrew
https://docs.sc.gov abateman@ors.sc.gov abateman@ors.s robsmith@mvalaw.com; Mustian, Ben < BMustian@ors.sc.gov>; bdurant@sowelldurant.com; Heather Smith <heather.smith@duke-energy.com>; Rebecca J. Dulin < Rebecca.Dulin@duke-energy.com>; J. Ashley Cooper <ashleycooper@parkerpoe.com>; willmiddleton@parkerpoe.com; Bateman, Andrew <abateman@ors.sc.gov>; Grube-Lybarker, Carri <clybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Hall, Roger <RHall@scconsumer.gov>; jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com; peter@energync.org; klee@selcsc.org; tspeer@turnerpadget.com; Nelson, Jeff < inelson@ors.sc.gov >; Pittman, Jenny <ipittman@ors.sc.gov>; jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com; Mustian, Ben <BMustian@ors.sc.gov>; bdurant@sowelldurant.com

Cc: PSC Contact < Contact@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: DEC/DEP Solar Choice Tariff Cases Procedural Matters (2020-264-E and 2020-265-E)

Parties:

I hope this finds you well. As we are approaching our hearing date, there are a few procedural matters that need to be handled regarding Docket Nos. 2020-264-E and 2020-265-E, the DEC and DEP Solar Choice Tariff cases.

First, I would ask that everyone complete the following virtual plan, so our IT personnel can get you the required information for the hearing:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2ZJPW5W

Please be sure to complete the survey (linked above) by close of business Friday, 3/5/21. Also – please let me know if you do, or do not, need or desire a virtual test.

Second, I note that the Commission has scheduled two days for this hearing. Due to recent experiences, I would like to inquire if the parties could give me a sense of whether the parties expect that additional time needs to be allocated for 60 the purpose of this proceeding, or whether the parties feel as though two days may be sufficient? Obviously, I inquire if the parties could give me a sense of whether the parties expect that additional time needs to be allocated for of the purpose of this proceeding, or whether the parties feel as though two days may be sufficient? Obviously, I understand the dynamic nature of litigation, but I am just trying to get a sense of whether additional time may be necessary to enable the Commission to plan accordingly.

As always, if there are procedural issues that I need to address, please let me know. I will do all that I can to facilitate and efficient proceeding.

Thanks and Regards,

David Stark

Attorney

South Carolina Public Service Commission

david.stark@psc.sc.gov

Enable the parties expect that additional time needs to be allocated for of the purpose of this proceeding. 12 to purpose of this proceeding, 12 to purpose of this proceeding, 12 to purpose of this proceeding, 12 to purpose of this purpose of this proceeding, 13 to purpose of this purpose of this proceeding, 14 to purpose of this purpose of the purpose of this purpose of this purpose of this purpose of this purpose of the purpose of the purpose of this purpose of the purpose of